

REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 20-22, 24, 31-32, 36, and 42 have been amended. Claims 1-19, 23, 27-30, 34-35, and 37-41 have been canceled. New claims 43-55 have been added. Claims 20-22, 24-26, 31-33, 36, and 42-55 are pending in the application. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the original claims and other claims in this and other applications.

Claims 20 and 41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Matheny et al. (US 6,766,524). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 20 recites an information service system comprising, *inter alia*, "a file which stores individual audience result information generated as a result of a media program/programs watched ... and individual interest information generated automatically by an information managing portion on the basis of said individual audience result information, ... and wherein the information management portion generates the individual audience result information when a program is kept on for a predetermined time or more by the information supply terminal" (emphasis added). Matheny et al. does not disclose these limitations.

To the contrary, Matheny et al. discloses that "[V]iewers must provide some feedback to indicate that they watched the commercial.... [S]et-top box 245 presents the viewer with a test question 265.... [V]iewers who watch the commercial are able to answer the question correctly.... Entering the correct answer in field 270 entitles a viewer to the offered reward." Col. 3, ln. 17-29 (emphasis added). Applicants respectfully submit that Matheny et al. does not disclose, teach, or suggest that the information management portion generates the individual audience result information when a program is kept on for a predetermined time or more by the information supply terminal as recited in claim 20. Since Matheny et al. does not disclose all the limitations

of claim 20, claim 20 is not anticipated by Matheny et al. Claim 41 has been canceled. Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of claim 20 be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Claims 31-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Arai et al. (US 6,486,920). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 31 and 32 recite an information supply terminal comprising, *inter alia*, “an information generator for generating individual audience result information on the basis of an individual identification result and said channel selection information and for automatically generating individual interest information on the basis of said individual audience result information..., wherein the information generator generates the individual audience result information when a channel is kept to be selected for a predetermined time or more by the information supply terminal” (emphasis added). Arai et al. does not disclose these limitations.

To the contrary, Arai et al. discloses “producing and displaying a ‘my channel’ consisting of programs fulfilling the search conditions (e.g., fee) given from the user.” Col. 8, ln. 48-49 (emphasis added). Applicants respectfully submit that Matheny et al. does not disclose, teach, or suggest that the information generator generates the individual audience result information when a channel is kept to be selected for a predetermined time or more by the information supply terminal as recited in claims 31 and 32. Since Arai et al. does not disclose all the limitations of claims 31 and 32, claims 31 and 32 are not anticipated by Arai et al. Claim 33 depends from claim 32, and is patentable at least for the reasons mentioned above, and on its own merits. Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of claims 31-33 be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Claims 21-30 and 42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arai et al. in view of Matheny et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed. In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness “the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.” M.P.E.P. §2142. Neither Arai et al. nor Matheny et al., even when considered in combination, teach or suggest all limitations of independent claims 21-22 or 42.

Claim 21 recites an information service system comprising, *inter alia*, “a file which stores individual audience result information generated as a result of a media program/programs watched by each of individual persons, ... wherein individual interest information is generated automatically by an information managing portion on the basis of said individual audience result information stored in said file, ... and wherein the information management portion generates the individual audience result information when a program is kept on for a predetermined time or more by the information supply terminal” (emphasis added). Arai et al. does not teach or suggest these limitations.

Claim 22 recites an information service system comprising, *inter alia*, “at least one of an interest information generating means and an interest information input means, ... individual interest information is generated automatically by an information managing portion on the basis of said individual audience result information, ... said individual interest information generated as said results of media programs watched by said individual persons is inputted from said information supply terminals; [and] a file managing means for managing a file of at least said individual interest information..., wherein the information management portion generates the individual audience result information when a program is kept on for a predetermined time or more by the information supply terminal” (emphasis added). Arai et al. does not teach or suggest these limitations.

Claim 42 recites a program for use in an information supply terminal, the terminal comprising a computer which, *inter alia*, “identifies an individual person, ... generates individual audience result information on the basis of an individual identification result and said channel selection information, [and] automatically generates individual interest information on the basis of said individual audience result information, ... wherein the individual audience result information is generated when a channel is kept to be selected for a predetermined time or more by the information supply terminal” (emphasis added). Arai et al. does not teach or suggest these limitations.

To the contrary, as discussed above, Arai et al. teaches “producing and displaying a ‘my channel’ consisting of programs fulfilling the search conditions (e.g., fee) given from the user.” Col. 8, ln. 48-49 (emphasis added). Arai et al. does not disclose, teach, or suggest that the information management portion generates the individual audience result information when a program is kept on for a predetermined time or more by the information supply terminal as recited in claims 21-22. Arai et al. also does not disclose, teach, or suggest that the individual audience result information is generated when a channel is kept to be selected for a predetermined time or more by the information supply terminal as recited in claim 42.

Nor does Matheny et al. disclose, teach, or suggest these limitations. As discussed above, Matheny et al. teaches “[V]iewers must provide some feedback to indicate that they watched the commercial.... [S]et-top box 245 presents the viewer with a test question 265.... [V]iewers who watch the commercial are able to answer the question correctly.... Entering the correct answer in field 270 entitles a viewer to the offered reward.” Col. 3, ln. 17-29 (emphasis added). Thus, Matheny et al. does not remedy the deficiencies of Arai et al.

Since Arai et al. and Matheny et al. do not teach or suggest all of the limitations of claims 21-22 and 42, claims 21-22 and 42 are not obvious over the cited references. Claims 24-26 depend from claim 22, and are patentable at least for the reasons mentioned above, and on their own merits. Claims 23 and 27-30 have been canceled. Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 21-22, 24-26, and 42 be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

Claims 34-36 and 39-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arai et al. in view of Eldering et al. (US 6,457,010). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 36 depends from claim 32 and is patentable at least for the reasons mentioned above, and on its own merits. Claims 34-35 and 39-40 have been canceled. Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 36 be withdrawn and the claim allowed.

Claims 37-38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arai et al. in view of Eldering et al., and further in view of Matheny et al. Claims 37-38 have been canceled.

In view of the above amendment, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: June 26, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Mark J. Thronson

Registration-No.: 33,082

Gianni Minutoli

Registration No.: 41,198

Rachael Lea Leventhal

Registration No.: 54,266

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &
OSHINSKY LLP

2101 L Street NW

Washington, DC 20037-1526

(202) 785-9700

Attorneys for Applicants